

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**SEP 21 2004**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

HARJIT SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 02-74416

Agency No. A72-473-567

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 10, 2004\*\*

Before: SKOPIL, FARRIS, and LEAVY, Circuit Judges.

Harjit Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' affirmance of the order of an Immigration Judge denying Singh's applications for asylum and withholding of exclusion and deportation.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as may be provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence an adverse credibility finding and a denial of asylum. See Malhi v. INS, 336 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny the petition.

Substantial evidence supports the adverse credibility finding. Singh first testified that he was taken from the Sikh temple to a police camp in November 1991 and that he was taken from his home to a different police camp in March 1992. Singh later testified that he was taken to a police camp only once, in March 1992. Singh did not provide an adequate explanation for his inconsistent testimony on a factor that is central to his asylum claim. See Singh v. Ashcroft, 367 F.3d 1139, 1143 (9th Cir. 2004).

Because Singh did not establish eligibility for asylum, he did not satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of exclusion and deportation. See Lata v. INS, 204 F.3d 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 2000).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.